



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,610	09/20/2007	Bing Ma	044574-5131-US	4815
9629 7590 02/18/2010 MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			EXAMINER OUSPENSKI, ILIA I	
			ART UNIT 1644	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/18/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,610

Applicant(s)

MA ET AL.

Examiner

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15, 16 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB06)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/04/2008
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ ~~Notes of Informal Patent Application~~
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's amendment and remarks filed on 11/17/2009 are acknowledged.

Claim 19 has been added.

Claims 1 – 19 are pending.

2. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1 – 14, 17 and 19) in the reply filed on 11/17/2009 is acknowledged. Applicant further elected the Species of COPD.

Claims 15, 16 and 18 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, under 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b), as being drawn to nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Claims 1 – 14, 17 and 19 are presently under consideration, as they read on the elected Species.

3. The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claim 7 is indefinite in the recitation of an antibody which "has the epitopic specificity of a monoclonal antibody," because the identity of the monoclonal antibody is not defined. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

B. Claim 13 is indefinite in the recitation of "the antibody or antigen binding fragment," because the "antigen binding fragment" lacks proper antecedent basis in the base claim.

Applicant is reminded that any amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to add new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06.

5. The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1 – 4, 17 and 19 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is not in possession of the claimed method, because Applicant is not in possession of the generically recited "Th1 and/or Th2 mediated diseases," or the generically recited "chemokine receptor 5 (CCR5) antagonist."

The instant specification discloses several exemplary Th1 and Th2 mediated diseases; however, the disclosure is not deemed to be sufficient to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the recited genus of diseases, because the genus encompasses conditions which differ from those disclosed in etiologies, molecular mechanisms, diagnostic approaches, treatment modalities, and therapeutic endpoints. Furthermore, the recited genus encompasses conditions yet to be discovered and/or characterized, therefore, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the contemplated diseases encompassed by the instant claims.

Likewise, a person of skill in the art cannot envision all the "antagonists" encompassed by the scope of the claims as presently recited, because it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made that molecules having highly diverse structural and chemical properties can affect cellular signaling. For example, Huang (Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 2000, 86: 201 – 215; see entire document) reviews e.g. on page 202 the daunting task faced by the skilled artisan in developing small molecule regulators of protein function, and notes that the process requires long periods of trial and error testing. In the absence of a disclosure in the instant specification of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics, such as complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics, the skilled artisan cannot envision all the contemplated CCR5 antagonists encompassed by the instant claims.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention. See Fiers v. Revel, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (CAFC 1993). The Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, §1 "Written Description" Requirement make clear that if a claimed genus does not show actual reduction to practice for a representative number of species; then the Requirement may be alternatively met by reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the genus (Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, Friday January 5, 2001, see especially page 1106 column 3).

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co., 43 USPQ2d 1398. Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, January 5, 2001.

7. Claims 1 – 14, 17 and 19 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to practice the invention.

The specification does not enable one of skill in the art to "prevent" the recited diseases, as claimed, without undue experimentation. Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to this rejection are the scope of the claim, the amount of direction or guidance provided, limited working examples, the unpredictability in the art and the amount of experimentation required to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

In evaluating the facts of the instant case, it is noted that in applying therapies based on therapeutic antibodies, in vitro and even animal model studies have not correlated well with in vivo clinical trial results in patients. Since the efficacy of therapeutic antibodies can be species- and model-dependent, it is unpredictable whether reliance on the experimental observations in the experimental model described in the instant specification provides the basis for employing the recited antibodies for preventing COPD or other diseases. One of skill in the art is aware that issues such as tissue distribution, half-life, affinity and avidity obtained with various antibodies targeting immune system receptors might prove to be highly important in achieving a preventive effect. Thus it is unpredictable whether the animal model used in the experiments disclosed in the specification would be indicative of success of the preventive methods encompassed by the claims.

Pharmaceutical therapies in the absence of in vivo clinical data are unpredictable for the following reasons; (1) the protein may be inactivated before producing an effect, i.e. such as proteolytic degradation, immunological inactivation or due to an inherently short half-life of the protein; (2) the protein may not reach the target area because, i.e. the protein may not be able to cross the mucosa or the protein may be adsorbed by fluids, cells and tissues where the protein has no effect; and (3) other functional properties, known or unknown, may make the protein unsuitable for in vivo therapeutic

use, i.e. such as adverse side effects prohibitive to the use of such treatment. See page 1338, footnote 7 of Ex parte Aggarwal, 23 USPQ2d 1334 (PTO Bd. Pat App. & Inter. 1992).

Further, the burden of enabling the prevention of a disease would be greater than that of enabling a treatment due to the need to screen those humans susceptible to such diseases and the difficulty of proof that the administration of the drug was the agent that acted to prevent the condition. Further, the specification does not provide guidance as to how one skilled in the art would go about screening those patients susceptible to COPD within the scope of the presently claimed invention. Nor is guidance provided as to a specific protocol to be utilized in order to prove the efficacy of the presently claimed compounds in preventing these disease states. Accordingly, undue experimentation is necessary to determine screening and testing protocols to demonstrate the efficacy of the presently claimed method in preventing COPD or other diseases.

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of **35 U.S.C. 102** that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 – 14, 17 and 19 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by Teeling et al. (US Patent No. 7,282,568; see entire document).

Teeling et al. teach methods comprising administering antibodies to CCR5, or other molecules that act as CCR5 antagonists (e.g. column 31, lines 24 – 30). Teeling et al. further teach that the methods can be used to treat pulmonary disorders, such as COPD (e.g. column 7, lines 43 – 45, and column 38, lines 53 – 55).

Therefore, the teachings of the reference anticipate the instant claimed invention.

10. Claims 1 – 4, 17 and 19 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by Shiota et al. (US Pat. Pub. No. 2007/0010509; see entire document).

Shiota et al. teach and claim remedies and prophylactics for treating COPD comprising CCR5 antagonists (e.g. claim 19). Inherent in these teachings is a method for treating COPD comprising administering CCR5 antagonists.

Therefore, the teachings of the reference anticipate the instant claimed invention.

11. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram R. Shukla can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ILIA OUSPENSKI/

ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1644

February 8, 2010